

REMARKS

The Applicant does not believe that examination of the foregoing amendment will result in the introduction of new matter into the present application for invention. Therefore, the Applicant, respectfully, requests that the above amendment be entered in and that the claims to the present application, kindly, be reconsidered.

The Office Action dated March 14, 2005 has been received and considered by the Applicants. Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application for invention. Claims 1-20 are rejected by the March 14, 2005 Office Action. Claims 1 and 13 have been objected to because "subject image" was misspelled as "subject mage". The foregoing amendment to the claims has corrected this oversight.

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 3-6, 8-10 and 15-17 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,966,135 issued in the name of Roy (hereinafter referred to as Roy).

Regarding Claim 1, the Examiner states that Roy at col. 11, lines 31-45 teaches a subject image within a browser, displaying an enlargement of the subject image in response to a user selecting a point on the subject image and displaying on that enlargement that point selected by the user (column 13, lines 25-29) and returning a point previously selected by the user as displayed on an enlargement of the subject mage as a first co-ordinate parameter (at column 13, lines 41-46 and column 19, lines 16-17). The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. Column 19, lines 41-46 of Roy simply states that the user can zoom to selected map objects and go back to the previous zoom level; which is not a disclosure or a suggestion for using a selected point as a co-ordinate parameter. Column 19, lines 16-17 of Roy simply contains a statement related to Appendix B that "projection parameters if we support objects defined in coordinates other than lat/lon"; which also is not a disclosure or a suggestion for using a selected point as a co-ordinate parameter. Therefore, this rejection is, respectfully, traversed.

Claims 3-5 depend from and further narrow and define Claim 1. Therefore, since Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons previously stated, Claims 3-5 are also believed to be allowable.

Regarding Claim 6, the Examiner states that Roy at column 12, lines 54-56 teaches using a further point selected by the user as a second co-ordinate parameter. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that column 12, lines 54-56 of Roy states that when new map objects are

chosen any previously chosen map objects are no longer chosen. There is no disclosure or suggestion within Roy for the further point to be used as a second co-ordinate parameter.

Therefore, this rejection is, respectfully, traversed.

Claims 8-10 depend from and further narrow and define Claim 1. Therefore, since Claim 1 is believed to be allowable for the reasons previously stated, Claims 8-10 are also believed to be allowable.

Regarding Claim 13, the Examiner states that Roy at col. 11, lines 31-45 teaches a subject image within a browser, displaying an enlargement of the subject image in response to a user selecting a point on the subject image and displaying on that enlargement that point selected by the user at column 13, lines 25-29 and identifying a point previously selected by the user as displayed on an enlargement of the subject image as a first co-ordinate parameter (at column 13, lines 41-46 and column 19, lines 16-17). The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. Column 19, lines 41-46 of Roy simply states that the user can zoom to selected map objects and go back to the previous zoom level; which is not a disclosure or a suggestion for identifying a selected point as a co-ordinate parameter. It should be noted that the subject matter defined by Claim 13 identifies the point selected as displayed on the enlarged image. Roy simply states that the object is selected, not identified, and furthermore not identified as displayed. Column 19, lines 16-17 of Roy simply contains a statement related to Appendix B that "projection parameters if we support objects defined in coordinates other than lat/lon"; which also is not a disclosure or a suggestion for identifying the selected point as displayed as a co-ordinate parameter. Therefore, this rejection is, respectfully, traversed.

Claim 15-16 depend from and further narrow and define Claim 13. Therefore, since Claim 13 is believed to be allowable for the previously stated reasons, Claims 15 and 16 are also believed to be allowable.

Regarding Claim 17, the Examiner states that Roy at column 12, lines 54-56 teaches using a further point selected by the user as a second co-ordinate parameter. The Applicant, respectfully, points out that column 12, lines 54-56 of Roy states that when new map objects are chosen any previously chosen map objects are no longer chosen. There is no disclosure or suggestion within Roy for the further point to be used as a second co-ordinate parameter. Therefore, this rejection is, respectfully, traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claims 2 and 14 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Roy in view of UK. Application No. 2,344,037 by Smith (hereinafter referred to as Smith).

Regarding Claim 2, the Examiner states that Roy teaches returning the point selected as displayed on the enlarged image of the subject image as a first co-ordinate parameter. As previously discussed, Roy does not return the point selected as displayed on the enlarged image of the subject image as a first co-ordinate parameter. The Examiner further states that Smith at page 5, lines 31-37 teaches returning a selected point at a co-ordinate parameter and displaying a reduction of a previous enlargement of the subject image in response to a single user input. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. Smith at page 5, lines 31-37 simply teaches a zoom out function and makes no mention of returning a selected point at a co-ordinate parameter and displaying a reduction of a previous enlargement of the subject image in response to a single user input. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding Claim 14, the Examiner states that Roy identifying the point selected as displayed on the enlarged image of the subject image as a first co-ordinate parameter. As previously discussed, Roy does not identify the point selected as displayed on the enlarged image of the subject image as a first co-ordinate parameter. The Examiner further states that Smith at page 5, lines 31-37 teaches identifying a selected point at a co-ordinate parameter and displaying a reduction of a previous enlargement of the subject image in response to a single user input. The Applicant, respectfully, disagrees. Smith at page 5, lines 31-37 simply teaches a zoom out function and makes no mention of identifying a selected point at a co-ordinate parameter and displaying a reduction of a previous enlargement of the subject image in response to a single user input. Therefore, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 11, 12 and 18-20 have been rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Roy in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 459, 986 issued in the name of Boyce (hereinafter referred to as Boyce).

Regarding Claims 7 and 18, the Examiner states that Roy teaches returning (identifying) a first co-ordinate parameter and a further point selected by the user as a second co-ordinate parameter. As previously discussed, Roy does not disclose or suggest returning (identifying) a first co-ordinate parameter and a further point selected by the user as a second co-ordinate

parameter. The Examiner further states that Boyce teaches a calculation for determining the distance between the first and second coordinates. The Applicant would like to point out that this rejection is taking the disclosure of Boyce completely out of context. Boyce teaches a routing system wherein the start end ending locations are specified by the user. The system taught by Boyce then eliminates routes and presents a list of suitable routes. The user selects a route and the system calculates a distance. Initially, the calculation of Boyce determines the distance between coordinates and vectors and not between the coordinates. Furthermore, the system of Boyce is far to complicated to operate in a manner as defined by the rejected claims. Boyce is not intended to operate in manner consistent with the subject matter defined by the rejected claims. Moreover, there is no calculation for determining the distance between the first and second coordinates made by Boyce.

The coordinates as defined by the rejected claims are not disclosed or suggested in either of the cited references. Therefore, this rejection is, respectfully, traversed.

Claims 11, 12, 19 and 20, depend from claims that as previously discussed are believed to be allowable and further narrow and define these claims. Therefore, Claims 11, 12, 19 and 20 are also believed to be allowable.

Applicant is not aware of any additional patents, publications, or other information not previously submitted to the Patent and Trademark Office which would be required under 37 C.F.R. 1.99.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant believes that the present application is in condition for allowance, with such allowance being, respectfully, requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

James D. Leimbach
Patent Attorney Reg. No. 34,374

Please address all correspondence for this application to:
Michael E. Belk, Senior Intellectual Property Counsel
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
Philips Electronics N.A. Corp.
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001 USA
(914) 333-9643.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence
is being transmitted on this date via
facsimile transmission to (703) 872-9306 AND addressed to:
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date of Transmission: July 14 2005

(Signature) 

By: James D. Leimbach